UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/590,666	08/25/2006	Shigeru Nakatsu	2006_1367A	3796	
	7590 11/17/200 , LIND & PONACK, I	EXAMINER			
1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			DARJI, PRITESH D		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1793		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/17/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/590,666	NAKATSU ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	PRITESH DARJI	1793						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 30 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	THE REPLY FILED 30 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the period of the	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);						
appeal; and/or	ion form for appear by materially rec	idenig of entiphityning a	10 100400 101					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/Steven Bos/	/PRITESH DARJI/							
Primary Examiner AU 1793	Examiner, Art Unit 1793							

Continuation of 11: applicant argues that the mixed acid process taught by Vesely is not used for the same purpose as instant invention. It is carried to dissolve the platinum residue in the aqua regia. However Vesely teaches mixed acid used for separating platinum from the residue as chloroplatinic acid. See col. 2, lines 36-54. Toshiyuki (JP'619) teaches the immersion of a metal carrier catalyst into mixed solution of sulfuric acid and phosphoric acid and after dissolving a metal carrier catalyst in the solution the noble metals (catalyst components) are collected out of solution. See [0010]. In the combination of references as a whole it would have been obvious to use nitric acid as functionally equivalent to phosphoric acid because both nitric acid and phosphoric acid are known to be used for treating noble metal catalysts. See Vesely col. 1, lines 55-65 and Toshiyuki [0010]. Applicant further argues that the examiner has not responded to portions of applicant's previous patentability arguemnts regarding comparative results set forth in the instant specification. However the comparative examples in the instant specification shows only 20wt% sulfuric acid being used which is not commensurate in scope with the instantly claimed mixed acid solution of sulfuric and nitric acids.

Continuation of 13. Other: The Final rejection is maintained for reasons of record stated therein.